DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 447 SE 055 705

TITLE	Engineering Education for a Changing World.
INSTITUTION	American Society for Engineering Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 94
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Society for Engineering Education, 1818 N Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($5).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Programs; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Engineering Education; Higher Education; Science Education

ABSTRACT

This is an era when the explosion of technology makes society increasingly dependent upon the quality of the engineers it produces. In response, engineering education was evaluated during a 2-day workshop to insure its adequacy to meet the demands of the 21st century. This report is intended to act as a guide for engineering colleges and their industrial, academic, and governmental partners to use in reform and as a measure of progress. The project took recommendations from other studies of engineering education, combined them with recommendations from their workshop and developed a short series of policy statements and a few key action items. The following action items are considered: (1) Individual Missions for Engineering; (2) Re-Examining Faculty Rewards; (3) Reshaping the Curriculum; (4) Lifelong Learning; (5) Broader Educational Responsibility; (6) Personnel Exchanges; (7) Across-the-Campus Outreach; and (8) Research/Resource sharing. Contains a list of related organizations and studies and task groups. (ZWH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ENGINEERING EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD

ED 382 447

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ANN LEIGH SPEICHER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

A joint Project by the
Engineering Deans Council
and
Corporate Roundtable
of the
American Society for
Engineering Education

SE 055 705

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENGINEERING EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD

Project Board

Eleanor Baum
Project Co-Chair
Dean of Engineering, The Cooper Union

Earl Dowell
Project Co-Chair
Dean of Engineering, Duke University

John McTague
Project Co-Chair
Vice President, Technical Affairs
Ford Motor Company

John Hocker
Director of Technical Operations
Martin Marietta Corporation

Winfred Phillips
Chair, ASEE Engineering Deans Council
Dean of Engineering, University of Florida

Project Manager

Ann Leigh Speicher
Manager, ASEE Office of Public Policy & Information

Table of Contents

2 **Letter of Acceptance**

3 **Project National Advisory Council**

5 **Letter from Engineering Deans**

8 **Preface**

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 **Executive Summary**

12 **Summary of Action Items**

15 **Project Report**

28 **Related Studies and Groups**

List of Task Groups

Photo courtesy of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Thompson-McClellan photographs



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Letter of Acceptance

October 13, 1994

Dear Colleague:

On behalf of the project National Advisory Council, we are pleased to forward this report, "Engineering Education For A Changing World" to the ASEE Engineering Deans Council and the engineering education community at large for consideration and action.

We live in an era when the explosion of technology makes society increasingly dependent upon the quality of the engineers it produces. And just as governments are undergoing tectonic changes and industry is altogether restructuring itself, it is time to address the adequacy of engineering education to meet the demands of the 21st century. We believe it is important to establish a few key action items that engineering colleges and their industrial, academic and governmental partners can use as a guide for reform and as a measure of progress. While many engineering colleges have already begun restructuring their programs, this report will help extend that effort to the wider community.

With the end of the Cold War, we have seen a rapid redirection of federal, industrial and public priorities and resources toward civil concerns. To be successful in this dynamic environment, engineering graduates need more than first-rate technical skills. They must also be able to work in teams and communicate well. Equally important, they must be able to view their work from a systems approach—across disciplines and within the context of political, international, and economic considerations.

To educate such graduates, engineering colleges must develop and strengthen partnerships with industry, government and the broader educational community. University leaders must provide support for these efforts. Likewise, industry must become more involved in the education of their current and future engineers. Governments, at every level, should encourage partnerships and foster educational experimentation and innovation. In sum, partnerships are the key to ensuring U.S. engineering education is relevant, attractive and connected to its clients and stakeholders and to the nation at large.

The National Advisory Council commends the project co-chairs, the task group chairs and all those who contributed to this report. The report, however, is but the first of many steps. We stand ready to participate in the implementation of the action items and urge the entire engineering education community to do the same.

Norman R. Augustine
Chairman and CEO
Martin Marietta Corporation
National Advisory Council Co-Chair

Charles M. Vest
President
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
National Advisory Council Co-Chair

Project National Advisory Council

Norman R. Augustine
Chairman and CEO, Martin Marietta Corporation
National Advisory Council Co-Chair

Charles M. Vest
President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
National Advisory Council Co-Chair

Hon. Richard Celeste
Former Governor, State of Ohio

Mr. Phil Condit
President, Boeing Corporation

Dr. Thomas Everhart
President, California Institute of Technology

Hon. Daniel Goldin
Administrator, NASA

Hon. Mary Good
Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Commerce

Mr. Irwin Jacobs
President and CEO, Qualcomm

Dr. Nannerl Keohane
President, Duke University

Dr. Peter Likins
President, Lehigh University

Dr. Larry Monteith
Chancellor, North Carolina State University

Dr. Richard Morrow
Past Chairman of the Board, Amoco Corporation

Dr. Benjamin Payton
President, Tuskegee University

Dr. Karl Pister
Chancellor, University of California-Santa Cruz

Mr. Lee R. Raymond
Chairman, Exxon Corporation

Dr. Harold Shapiro
President, Princeton University

Dr. John Slaughter
President, Occidental College

Mr. Robert Stempel
Past Chairman and CEO, General Motors Corporation

Dr. Chang-Lin Tien
Chancellor, University of California-Berkeley

Dr. Curtis Tompkins
President, Michigan Technological University

Mr. James Vincent
Chairman and CEO, Biogen

Hon. George Voinovich
Governor, State of Ohio

Mr. Harold Yoh
Chairman and CEO, Day & Zimmerman

October 13, 1994

Dr. Eleanor Baum
Dr. Earl Dowell
Dr. John McTague

Dear Eleanor, Earl and John:

On behalf of the Engineering Deans Council, it is my pleasure to accept the report "Engineering Education for a Changing World." The National Advisory Council, the task groups and the project board have produced an appropriate challenge for engineering schools and their leadership. I am confident of a positive response in the near term. A number of the recommendations are currently being implemented by some schools and some of the recommendations are being implemented by many.

Toward a longer view, the foresight of the National Science Foundation in sponsoring this study and establishing the engineering education coalitions has truly set the stage for change in response to the challenges we face.

Engineering education programs are the most examined and responsive in higher education. Our partnership with industry and government is a tradition well represented in the report and action plan. While some may seek drama and immediacy in plans for change, our record shows that a careful plan, a partnership approach and an informed constituency are key elements to progress. Your study has followed this approach and produced a fine plan in a brief time scale without precedent. Many studies begin; most take a much longer time and fewer are finished. Congratulations.

Engineering schools are seeking appropriate outcomes assessment. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology has revised the general program criteria to accommodate needed changes. The professional societies are examining the international challenge and economic competitiveness. U.S. engineering education is the best in the world but to remain so it must respond to many of the recommendations in your report. U.S. industry and government expect no less. Our students deserve even more.

Thank you and all our colleagues who participated in the project for setting the stage for appropriate opportunity. The ball is now in our court.

Sincerely,

Winfred M. Phillips

Winfred M. Phillips, Chair
ASEE Engineering Deans Council

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENGINEERING EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD

A Joint Project by the

Engineering Deans Council

and

Corporate Roundtable

of the

American Society for

Engineering Education

October, 1994

Photo (left) courtesy of University of Wisconsin-Madison

Preface

The idea for this project originated last year at a joint meeting of the ASEE Engineering Deans Council Executive Committee and the ASEE Corporate Roundtable. Norman Augustine, Chairman and CEO of Martin Marietta Corporation and Chair of the Corporate Roundtable, suggested that with the end of the Cold War, engineering education needed a new set of guiding principles to replace those that had been developed following World War II. Rather than a world based largely on superpower competition and national security, engineers now faced a world of intense international economic competition and widespread public uncertainty about the uses of technology.

In response to this challenge, the ASEE Engineering Deans Council and the Corporate Roundtable held a planning meeting in November, 1993, and developed an outline for the project. Since other studies of engineering education were ongoing, it was agreed that along with writing a short, action-oriented report, the project would do two things: focus on "partnerships" as a critical element in making change and produce a specific, feasible plan for implementation following release of the report. To provide guidance and oversight for the project, MIT President Charles Vest agreed to co-chair a national advisory council with Norman Augustine.

A two-day workshop was held in February, 1994, to examine key issues in engineering education. The meeting was built around the work of five task groups—each assigned to look at a different aspect of the issues—which were made up of deans of engineering, corporate executives and government agency representatives. Based on the reports and recommendations of those task groups, the Project Board developed a draft report. It focused on areas we felt could make the biggest difference in helping engineering colleges meet the challenges of the new world of engineering.

We sent out the draft report to the workshop participants, every dean of engineering, the ASEE Corporate Roundtable members and members of the project National Advisory Council. We were gratified by the enthusiastic response to the report; the comments were thoughtful and constructive and many have been incorporated into the report. It was also encouraging to learn that many engineering colleges already have been re-examining their colleges' mission and programs, and plan to use the study report to facilitate that process.

In June, we presented an outline of the report to an overflow crowd at a miniplenary session at the ASEE annual conference. The resulting discussion showed us how important these issues were to engineering educators and how widespread was the view that engineering colleges needed to make significant change.

To promote further discussion, the report will be made available on the Internet.

With publication of the report, we now look ahead to the implementation phase of the project. Over the next few years, the ASEE Engineering Deans Council will lead the effort to assess what engineering colleges are doing to effect change, refine the action items of the report, and set milestones for assessing future progress toward their implementation. We look forward to broad participation in that task.



Earl Dowell
Dean of Engineering
Duke University



Eleanor Baum
Dean of Engineering
The Cooper Union



John McTague
Vice President, Technical Affairs
Ford Motor, Company

Acknowledgements

The study co-chairs would like to express particular thanks to the other members of our Project Board: Winfred Phillips, Chair of the ASEE Engineering Deans Council, and John Hocker, Director of Technical Operations at Martin Marietta Corporation, for their invaluable work. They both spent many hours helping plan the workshop, assessing the key issues and developing the report.

Providing the basis of the report was the work of the five task groups and their chairs, who not only thought through the issues in their individual areas of responsibility, but organized their task groups to develop summary reports and specific action items. We extend special thanks to the task group chairs: James Eifert, Dean of Engineering at Rose-Hulman Institute, William Schowalter, Dean of Engineering at the University of Illinois-Urbana, J. Ray Bowen, Dean of Engineering at the University of Washington; John Bollinger, Dean of Engineering at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and George Dieter, former Dean of Engineering at the University of Maryland-College Park.

We also greatly appreciate the outstanding leadership of the co-chairs of our National Advisory Council, Norman Augustine and Charles Vest, who provided key advice and support throughout development of the project. Members of the National Advisory Council also provided many thoughtful comments on the draft report.

Our thanks are also extended to Ann Leigh Speicher, Project Manager of the study, for her tireless work and enthusiasm for the project.

In addition, we thank the Engineering Directorate of the National Science Foundation and Martin Marietta Corporation for their financial support, which made the project possible.

While engineering education in the United States has served the nation well, there is broad recognition that it must change to meet new challenges. These challenges include the need to attract a greater diversity of students, as well as the shift from a technology policy strongly focused on national security to one aimed more diffusely at international economic competitiveness, communications and sustainable development. Moreover, with technology playing a growing role in both professional and public policy decisions, it is important that engineers be prepared to participate actively in decision making processes.

Engineering education programs must be RELEVANT, ATTRACTIVE and CONNECTED:

- RELEVANT to the lives and careers of students, preparing them for a broad range of careers, as well as for lifelong learning involving both formal programs and hands-on experience;
- ATTRACTIVE so that the excitement and intellectual content of engineering will attract highly talented students with a wider variety of backgrounds and career interests—particularly women, under-represented minorities and the disabled—and will empower them to succeed; and
- CONNECTED to the needs and issues of the broader community through integrated activities with other parts of the educational system, industry and government.

In response to these needs, engineering colleges around the country are experimenting with new approaches to teaching and learning, developing innovative ways to recruit and retain students from under-represented groups and seeking new educational and research relationships with industry. We believe such efforts can be strengthened and extended to the broader engineering education community through a national effort of identifying key action items and following up on their implementation. A key element in the success of these efforts will be partnerships: partnerships not only with industry, but with K-12 schools, community colleges, the broader university community, government, and among engineering colleges.

The Project. The aim of this project is to take recommendations from other studies of engineering education, combine them with recommendations from the workshop conducted as part of the present study, and develop a short series of policy statements and a few key action items. Each of the action items focuses on partnerships. Over the next few years, the ASEE Engineering Deans Council will assess the accomplishments of engineering colleges toward reaching these goals, further refine the action items, and establish a series of milestones for measuring future progress within the engineering education community.

Summary of Action Items

A. Individual Missions For Engineering Colleges

1. Every engineering college should identify the constituencies it serves, establish a clear vision, define its mission through a conscious examination of the school's current activities and comparative advantages, and then set future strategic directions.
2. Within the context of the overall institutional vision, every engineering educational program should be driven by a periodically-reviewed planning process. This process should identify the program's objectives and lead to a specific plan, with milestones, for accomplishing them. Internal and external reviews of each engineering education program, which should include industrial participation, should encourage progress toward meeting those stated objectives.

B. Re-Examining Faculty Rewards

3. As each institution establishes its vision and charts new directions, it should ensure that its faculty reward system supports the institutional goals.

C. Reshaping the Curriculum

4. While recognizing and encouraging diverse institutional missions and changing industry needs, colleges of engineering must re-examine their curricula and programs to ensure they prepare students for the broadened world of engineering work. This process has begun among most engineering colleges and must be accelerated with the aim to incorporate:
   - team skills, including collaborative, active learning,
   - communication skills,
   - leadership,
   - a systems perspective,
   - an understanding and appreciation of the diversity of students, faculty and staff,
   - an appreciation of different cultures and business practices, and the understanding that the practice of engineering is now global,
   - integration of knowledge throughout the curriculum,
   - a multi-disciplinary perspective,
   - a commitment to quality, timeliness and continuous improvement,
   - undergraduate research and engineering work experience,
   - an understanding of the societal, economic and environmental impacts of engineering decisions, and
   - ethics.

D. Lifelong Learning

5. Federal agencies that fund education should help universities and their industrial partners identify creative approaches to lifelong learning by funding pilot projects and experiments.
6. Engineering colleges should create innovative advanced degree programs, including practice-oriented degrees. Such degree programs might include course material on engineering systems; finance and accounting; technology policy; management and decision-making. Courses should feature team-based activities and case studies. In some instances, engineering schools will develop such degree programs in collaboration with business schools and industry.

7. Engineering colleges, in collaboration with industry, should develop innovative ways of providing continuing education to practicing engineers by instituting non-degree, career-enhancing programs. This will be facilitated by new communications technologies.

E. Broader Educational Responsibility

8. Each engineering college, in cooperation with local industry, should partner with at least one local school at the K-12 level. The aim is to improve mathematics and science instruction, provide role models, and give students and teachers a greater understanding of engineering's role in society.

F. Personnel Exchanges

9. The federal government, in partnership with engineering colleges and industry, should develop a national program to foster creation of "industrial professorships" in engineering colleges. Financing might include tax incentives for industry.
10. Each engineering college, or group of colleges in a region, should develop reciprocal personnel exchange programs with local and regional corporations. Companies and engineering colleges should encourage participation in these exchanges by providing incentives to individuals who are selected to participate. These partnerships must also focus on meeting the real needs of both corporate and university participants, and feature a variety of exchange modes, including industrial professorships and university sabbaticals in industry.

G. Across-the-Campus Outreach

11. Engineering deans should actively encourage their faculty members to participate in research, educational and leadership activities beyond the engineering college. Industrial advisory board members should stress cross-campus interaction in their recommendations to the college. Activities should include connections with such units as the schools of business, medicine, arts, sciences and education.
12. Engineering deans and faculty should actively encourage students to participate in university-wide activities. These activities can include participation in student government, student professional societies, athletics, performing arts, study abroad and similar activities. The aim is to promote leadership and communications skills, as well as a sense of the integration of engineering into the broader world.
13. Engineering deans should take responsibility for helping non-engineering majors on their campuses better understand the importance and relevance of technology in their lives, and seek to better equip those students to prosper in an increasingly technological world. Engineering schools may develop specific courses, seminars, guest lectureships and cross-campus projects.

H. Research/Resource Sharing

14. Federal agencies that fund research and education should explore ways of encouraging educational institutions, research organizations, federal laboratories and industry to share resources. They should provide special consideration for funding projects that are developed by consortia of institutions.
15. Federal funding of science and technology should be allocated in open competition, based on peer review.
16. To enhance technology transfer and industry-university research partnerships, universities, industries and federal agencies should develop flexible and negotiable policies governing intellectual property rights.

The policy statements and action items developed in this project are intended to help ensure that engineering education will be RELEVANT, ATTRACTIVE *and* CONNECTED *well into the 21st century.*

ENGINEERING EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD

Project Report

Introduction

We live in a time of revolutionary change. Not only is the world relying increasingly on technology for economic growth and job development, but the nation is making the difficult transition of refocusing a significant amount of its technology investment from national security to international economic competitiveness. At the same time, we view technology as important in helping solve many difficult societal problems, from creating environmentally-sustainable development and improving communications, to devising more effective and cost-efficient health care systems. Communications developments alone are leading to profound redefinitions of such concepts as "community," "library," "corporation" and even "university."

Within this technological context, engineers play an ever more significant role. They develop new manufacturing processes and products; create and manage energy, transportation and communications systems; prevent new and redress old environmental problems; create pioneering health care devices and, in general, make technology work. Through these activities, engineers create a huge potential for the private sector to develop national wealth. As noted by Richard Morrow, past chairman of the National Academy of Engineering, "the nation with the best engineering talent is in possession of the core ingredient of comparative economic and industrial advantage."[1] And just as important as their specific technical skills, engineers receive valuable preparation for a host of other careers in such areas as finance, medicine, law and management. These professions require analytical, integrative and problem-solving abilities, all of which are part of an engineering education. Thus, engineering is an ideal undergraduate education for living and working in the technologically-dependent society of the twenty-first century.

Responding to Changing Needs

One of the strengths of engineering education in the United States is the broad spectrum of engineering colleges whose development has been unconstrained by a single, centrally-prescribed mission. The more than 300 colleges of engineering range from highly research-intensive institutions to those that focus largely on undergraduate education, with many variations in between. Even with the considerable differences in missions, undergraduate engineering education programs maintain universal core curriculum content and minimum standards through the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), a national partnership between academics and practicing engineers. Additionally, most engineering schools have forged close relationships with industry and bene-

fit from annual assessments of their programs by external advisory boards that have strong industry participation.

While U.S. engineering education has served the nation well, there is broad recognition that it must change to meet new challenges. This is fully in keeping with its history of changing to be consistent with national needs. Today, engineering colleges must not only provide their graduates with intellectual development and superb technical capabilities, but following industry's lead, those colleges must educate their students to work as part of teams, communicate well, and understand the economic, social, environmental and international context of their professional activities. These changes are vital to the nation's industrial strength and to the ability of engineers to serve as technology and policy decision makers. Most important, engineering education programs must attract an ethnic and social diversity of students that better reflects the diversity of the U.S. and takes full advantage of the nation's talents. Not only does the engineering profession require a spectrum of skills and backgrounds, but it should preserve its historical role as a profession of upward mobility.

In response to these needs, engineering colleges throughout the country are experimenting with new approaches to curricula, re-thinking traditional teaching modes, and developing innovative ways to recruit and retain students from under-represented groups. The largest and potentially most revolutionary effort is led by the consortia of colleges funded by the National Science Foundation's Engineering Education Coalitions program. These national engineering college consortia each include a variety of schools ranging from predominantly undergraduate institutions to the most research intensive. The consortia are working to redesign curricula and improve teaching methodologies, each offering a different perspective and strategy. While it is too early to gauge the success of the coalitions, they exemplify the engineering education community's leadership and willingness to adjust to change. We applaud and encourage these efforts, but also stress the importance of including partnerships with industry and government in reformulating engineering education.

Photo courtesy of Michigan State University

Studies of Engineering Education

Given the national importance of engineering education and the major changes taking place in higher education and society, it is no surprise that in recent years engineering education has stimulated a variety of thoughtful reports. For example, in the late 1980s ASEE published the major study, "Quality of Engineering Education," and the ASEE Engineering Deans Council produced spe-

cific reports on the supply of engineering faculty and students. In 1991, the National Academies' National Research Council (NRC) created a Board on Engineering Education, which has conducted a wide-ranging study of the future of engineering education.[2] The Board's work has included a series of hearings throughout the country and has had a valuable influence on this project.

Those studying engineering education have proposed many ways to make engineering programs more relevant and cost-effective for all students, as well as more attractive to historically under-represented groups. Their recommendations have created an environment for change and experimentation.

Photo courtesy of University of Wisconsin-Platteville

The Action Plan

The aim of this project is to evaluate recommendations of previous studies, combine them with the recommendations of the workshop conducted as part of the present study, and then develop key action items based on a series of policy statements. Because certain key changes in engineering education will be most effective if implemented with the aid of all sectors of the community, this project focuses on action items that require partnerships. Some of the action items are short-term, others longer-term; none is necessarily easy to accomplish. Over the next few years, this project will further refine the action items, assess the accomplishments of engineering colleges toward those goals, and establish a series of milestones for measuring future progress within the engineering education community.

In today's world and in the future, engineering education programs must not only teach the fundamentals of engineering theory, experimentation and practice, but be RELEVANT, ATTRACTIVE and CONNECTED:

- RELEVANT to the lives and careers of students, preparing them for a broad range of careers, as well as for lifelong learning involving both formal programs and hands-on experience;
- ATTRACTIVE so that the excitement and intellectual content of engineering will attract highly talented students with a wider variety of backgrounds and career interests—particularly women, under-represented minorities and the disabled—and will empower them to succeed; and
- CONNECTED through partnerships and integrated activities with K-12 schools; community colleges; the full breadth of the university; local, regional and national communities; industry and government.

Engineering colleges' ability to make their programs both relevant and attractive will depend, to a large extent, on how well they connect their programs to all community sectors, that is, on how well they build partnerships.

Focusing On Partnerships

While engineering deans are principally responsible for leading engineering education, they work in partnership with their faculties, presidents, senior university administrators, and often, with industry representatives. Such partnerships must also extend to elementary and secondary schools, the broader university, the local community, government and other engineering colleges, and build even closer ties to industry. These sectors make up the broad constituency of engineering education. Collaboration with these groups ensures the vitality and relevance of engineering programs, and enables the sharing of resources in a fiscally-constrained era. Ultimately, engineering colleges—like their successful counterparts in industry—must be part of a seamless system that links all of their constituents in education, industry and the broad public community.

Action Items

A. Individual Missions For Engineering Colleges. Following the expansion of government resources for university research after World War II, many universities and their engineering colleges aspired to the model of the "research-intensive" university. This model focused on developing research excellence in scientific and engineering fields, and on creating research-oriented doctoral degrees. While not all universities and engineering colleges adopted the research-intensive model, many have viewed it as a standard of excellence.

The world now demands new models. There is greater competition for federal research funding, with fewer current employment opportunities for new, research-oriented PhDs. The nation is shifting the focus of engineering work and research from a heavy emphasis on national security needs and space exploration to a more applications-oriented focus on economic growth and environmental preservation. Moreover, burgeoning communications technologies are enabling engineering schools to expand their reach and accessibility, and to experiment with alternate modes of teaching and learning.

This shift creates new opportunities for redesigning curricula and programs, expanding relationships with industry and educating students who are both technically capable and broadly sophisticated.

These developments have also created a new opportunity for engineering colleges to re-define themselves and to even develop specific niches within the broader engineering education community. While retaining a unified core of knowledge, engineering colleges must become more "context-based," that is, more relevant to the needs of their constituents. .

To accomplish this redefinition, each engineering college—including the dean, faculty and administrators, in concert with the partners discussed previously—must identify the constituents it serves, assess the school's activities, identify its comparative advantages, and develop an institution-specific vision. Then, from that vision, the engineering school must articulate its mission.

The need will continue for schools that educate engineers with sound fundamentals to practice the profession. But a variety of models in engineering education will result from the process of schools re-examining their individual missions. For example, some colleges may opt to combine elements of traditional technology-based engineering education with a strong emphasis on broader skills such as written and oral communication, management, economics and international relations. This type of program would aim to prepare individuals for technological decision-making and policy setting as well as for non-engineering professions.

Other engineering colleges may choose to become more like "professional" schools, preparing students for professional engineering practice through the master's level. Such programs would model themselves after schools of law and medicine, in which engineering practitioners from industry would work on-site, providing clinical training and assistance. Unlike the other models, however, that of the engineering professional school would continue to incorporate undergraduate as well as graduate education.

As some engineering schools are already doing, the practice-oriented master's degree could be the result of a five- or six-year program that incorporated a four-year bachelor's degree. This type of master's program is particularly attractive to high-technology industries that want engineering graduates who understand basic management, manufacturing, large-scale systems engineering and leadership. An issue is whether industry will fund such programs in significant measure, as they now support Master's in Business Administration degrees for their engineers.

Still other engineering colleges may decide to focus on PhD-related research and preparing graduates for research and teaching careers. This decision must be taken with the full understanding, however, that the nation's support system for research is changing and there will likely be fewer research positions available through industry, the federal government and academe.

Engineering education needs these and other models, combinations of models, and more. No one model suits every engineer or every organization that engineers serve. This diversity in the engineering educational system encourages creativity and satisfies the varied interests and needs of employers and students in the United States and abroad.

1. Every engineering college should identify the constituencies it serves, establish a clear vision, define its mission through a conscious examination of the school's current activities and comparative advantages, and then set future strategic directions.

2. Within the context of the overall institutional vision, every engineering educational program should be driven by a periodically-reviewed planning process. This process should identify the program's objectives and lead to a specific plan, with milestones, for accomplishing them. Internal and external reviews of each engineering education program, which should include industrial participation, should encourage progress toward meeting those stated objectives.

B. Re-Examining Faculty Rewards. In whatever way an engineering college defines its mission, to be successful, it must ensure its faculty reward system supports its goals. Faculty members often face the difficult task of trying to balance the several activities they need for professional advancement—such as research and undergraduate teaching—with a host of new activities their colleagues, students and the public expect them to accomplish. These can include curricula development, inter-disciplinary collaboration, work with industry, development of continuing education programs, community outreach and mentoring of other faculty members and students. As engineering colleges develop institutional missions, they have an opportunity to re-craft their faculty reward system to better synchronize faculty rewards with their new, or re-affirmed, institutional expectations.

Changing the faculty reward system will not be an easy task. Faculty rewards are heavily driven by incentives created across the entire university and are part of a nationwide network. Nevertheless, it is important that rewards reflect the goals of the institution and it is important to begin the conversation now.



3. As each institution establishes its vision and charts new directions, it should ensure that its faculty reward system supports the institutional goals.

C. Reshaping the Curriculum. Through its accreditation process, the U.S. engineering education system has continually re-examined and re-energized the engineering curricula. Engineering fundamentals have been and will continue to be the core of the engineering curriculum. But because engineers now operate in a world where their accomplishments are often more limited by societal considerations than by technical capabilities, they are engaging in a wider range of activities throughout their professional lives. Thus, engineering education must

take into account the social, economic and political contexts of engineering practice, help students develop teamwork and communication skills, and motivate them to acquire new knowledge and capabilities on their own. Because many modern engineering projects require a combination of several disciplines, students also need exposure to the integrative field of systems engineering. In essence, an engineering education today aims to prepare an engineer to be successful in the changing workplace. It aims to equip students with technical knowledge and capabilities, flexibility and an understanding of the societal context of engineering.

Engineering schools should not seek to develop these contextual and process skills through separate courses, but by incorporating them into existing curricula and through non-classroom activities. Coursework should feature multi-disciplinary, collaborative, active learning and take into account students' varied learning styles.

One factor that will promote development of students' process skills is widespread use of multi-media, world-wide information networks. Using this resource, students can access new information and coursework, as well as interact with other students, researchers, practicing engineers in industry and government, and experts from around the world. These changes in the teaching and learning environment will make engineering education more attractive to both students and faculty, if faculty are given the opportunity to stay up-to-date.

Finally, all engineering colleges must address the issue of ethics. While ethics is a complex and difficult topic, engineering administrators and faculty must help students understand that throughout their careers they will encounter ethical issues which they will need to recognize and deal with rationally. Whether engineers are conducting engineering research, managing a company, or building bridges and office buildings, their decisions affect the lives and property of the greater community. Students must understand the importance of upholding that public trust.

4. While recognizing and encouraging diverse institutional missions and changing industry needs, colleges of engineering must re-examine their curricula and programs to ensure they prepare their students for the broadened world of engineering work. This process has begun among most engineering colleges and must be accelerated with the aim to incorporate:

- *team skills, including collaborative, active learning,*
- *communication skills,*

- *leadership,*
- *a systems perspective,*
- *an understanding and appreciation of the diversity of students, faculty and staff,*
- *an appreciation of different cultures and business practices, and the understanding that the practice of engineering is now global,*
- *integration of knowledge throughout the curriculum,*
- *a multi-disciplinary perspective,*
- *a commitment to quality, timeliness and continuous improvement,*
- *undergraduate research and engineering work experience,*
- *an understanding of the societal, economic and environmental impacts of engineering decisions, and*
- *ethics.*

Photo courtesy of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

D. Lifelong Learning. Employment practices among major corporations are changing dramatically; few future engineers will experience lifelong employment with a single corporation or organization. Many may perform professional work as consultants or serve as contract employees on specific projects. To adapt to this new work environment, engineering graduates must understand that career-long learning is their own responsibility and must acquire the skills for self-learning. Although many engineering colleges offer continuing education, such programs are often degree-oriented and constrained by the academic-year cycle.

To be relevant to new graduates, as well as to practicing engineers at every stage of their careers, engineering colleges must re-think and re-package continuing education programs. They should focus their offerings on providing students with new capabilities, as well as degrees. Courses should take various forms—with some targeted to business and financial management—and be adaptable to the time constraints of working engineers. In this regard, it will be crucial that continuing education programs take full advantage of the evolving National Information Infrastructure (NII).

Industry should require and pay for engineering employees to take courses to sustain their technological and managerial competence, just as it pays to maintain its other assets.

5. Federal agencies that fund education should help universities and their industrial partners identify creative approaches to lifelong learning by funding pilot projects and experiments.

6. Engineering colleges should create innovative advanced degree programs, including practice-oriented degrees. Such degree programs might include course material on engineering systems; finance and accounting; technology policy; management and decision-making. Courses should feature team-based activities and case studies. In some instances, engineering schools will develop such degree programs in collaboration with business schools and industry.

7. Engineering colleges, in collaboration with industry, should develop innovative ways of providing continuing education to practicing engineers by instituting non-degree, career-enhancing programs. This will be facilitated by new communications technologies.

E. Broader Educational Responsibility. The engineering profession has played a little-recognized but extremely important role in providing upward mobility for generations of young people. There is now a major opportunity for the profession to do the same for under-represented minorities, women and the disabled. But engineering differs from most other professions in that one must make the decision early in secondary school to preserve the option to become an engineer. Engineering colleges must reach out and connect to K-12 schools in their communities to ensure that students, particularly in middle school and high school, have the information they need to make informed decisions about an engineering career. Engineering colleges should view this outreach as a partnership with school administrators and teachers, as well as with local industry. Joint activities might include developing summer and evening courses for teachers on-campus or at a local corporate facility; forming a speakers' bureau; providing mentors; and offering laboratory classes taught by faculty, engineering students and corporate engineers. Activities should focus on needs expressed by K-12 school administrators and teachers, not just on those activities engineering educators and their corporate colleagues are presently prepared to provide.

Outreach activities should not only strive to improve mathematics, science and technology instruction, but to motivate students to consider engineering careers. These activities are also important for helping all students better understand the implications of technology for society.

8. Each engineering college, in cooperation with local industry, should partner with at least one local school at the K-12 level. The aim is to improve mathematics and science instruction, provide role models, and give students and teachers a greater understanding of engineering's role in society.

F. Personnel Exchanges. Exchanging faculty, graduate students and engineers from industry and government is one of the most effective ways of promoting technology transfer and ensuring that faculty and students are exposed to engineering practice. Time spent by engineering faculty and graduate students in industry can enhance transfer of new technologies to industry, as well as provide practical experience and an understanding of business policies. Time spent by industry experts in engineering colleges can help make engineering coursework and research more relevant to actual practice.

At many colleges of engineering, effective personnel exchange mechanisms are already in place through adjunct faculty positions, student/faculty internships and cooperative work study programs. However, we believe there is value in enabling industry executives and technical specialists to spend time on-campus as full-time faculty members. Rather than simply teaching occasional courses, these "industrial professors" would participate directly in specific educational projects. Such projects might, for example, include integrating manufacturing, design, cost and environmental technology issues into the curriculum.

To be most effective, personnel exchange experiences must be incorporated into the career plans of top-quality employees. Companies must be willing to allow those individuals to participate in exchange programs during their active technical and managerial years without fear of falling off their career tracks. Similarly, engineering colleges must find the means to enable their own faculty to participate in such programs without fear of being deflected from their tenure objectives or losing research support for their laboratories and graduate students. As one alternative, engineering colleges should consider using their sabbatical leave policies to encourage faculty members to spend time in industry or government.

9. The federal government, in partnership with engineering colleges and industry, should develop a national program to foster creation of "industrial professorships" in engineering colleges. Financing might include tax incentives for industry.

10. Each engineering college, or group of colleges in a region, should develop reciprocal personnel exchange programs with local and regional corporations. Companies and engineering colleges should encourage participation in these exchanges by providing incentives to individuals who are selected to participate. These partnerships must also focus on meeting the real needs of both corporate and university participants, and feature a variety of exchange modes, including industrial professorships and university sabbaticals in industry.

G. Across-the-Campus Outreach. Engineering colleges must be more effective and visible partners within the broader university community. This partnership should be enhanced for non-classroom activities as well as for formal research and education. Engineering colleges, their faculty and students have much to offer the broader campus community. For example, engineers can provide the real-world context to show non-engineering students the applications of the mathematical and scientific concepts they are learning. Engineering educators and their colleagues in science can also provide leadership in helping their campuses initiate computer networking and make effective use of the information super highway. Industry can help foster this cross-campus interaction by bringing multi-faceted problems to the university that require the talents of several disciplines to solve. Industry representatives who sit on university advisory boards should also stress this approach in their recommendations to the institution.

Conversely, engineering education programs have much to gain from other disciplines. New insights can be provided, for example, by chemistry in developing environmentally-friendly technologies, by political science in teaching the value of issues advocacy, by art in designing new consumer products, by business in aiding the understanding of international trade issues and by law in treating intellectual property rights. Both engineering students and faculty would benefit from such interdisciplinary collaboration.

Engineers working with other colleagues across the university can also promote technological literacy for all students. Engineering colleges should accept responsibility for providing technical literacy programs to liberal arts students. Activities can include developing and teaching courses that provide laboratory or design experience for non-engineers, examine the history of science and technology, or discuss the interaction of technology and society.

At the same time, student participation in university-wide activities, such as student government, professional societies, athletics and performing arts can help them develop the leadership and communications skills that are an important part of an engineering education.

11. Engineering deans should actively encourage their faculty members to participate in research, educational and leadership activities beyond the engineering college. Industrial advisory board members should stress cross-campus interaction in their recommendations to the college. Activities should include connections with such units as the schools of business, medicine, arts, sciences, and education.

12. Engineering deans and faculty should actively encourage students to participate in university-wide activities. These activities can include participation in student government, student professional societies, athletics, performing arts, debate, study abroad and similar activities. The aim is to promote leadership and communications skills, as well as a sense of the integration of engineering into the broader world.

13. Engineering deans should take responsibility for helping non-engineering majors on their campuses better understand the importance and relevance of technology in their lives, and seek to better equip those students to prosper in an increasingly technological world. Engineering schools may develop specific courses, seminars, guest lectureships and cross-campus projects.

Photo courtesy of University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

H. Research/Resource Sharing. Given the changing direction and magnitude of support for research sponsored by the federal government and industry, coupled with the increased competition from federal laboratories and international groups, engineering colleges must look for new opportunities to establish collaborative research alliances. Some alliances may be local or regional; others will be "virtual," that is, national or international alliances established through the emerging global information superhighway.

Regional consortia of engineering colleges, for example, may share research facilities, teaching laboratories and faculty. Faculty tenure might even reside with a consortium and not with the individual institutions. Other types of consortia could combine the resources of universities and industry, universities and federal facilities—such as national laboratories—or a combination of all three. The aim is not to create new bureaucracies and expense, but to facilitate high-quality research and teaching that is both effective and efficient.

The National Science Foundation has taken the lead in funding experiments in research and education resource-sharing and in creation of virtual research and education teams. Such experiments also should be encouraged through the Engineering Research Center (ERC) and Science and Technology Center (STC) programs. Lessons learned by the NSF Engineering Education Coalitions in creating virtual research and education teams should be applied to these experiments.

To ensure high-quality research and education, federal funding for science and technology must be distributed through open competition, based on peer review. To enhance technology transfer and industry-university research partnerships, universities, corporations and federal agencies should ensure they have flexible and negotiable policies governing intellectual property rights.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. Federal agencies that fund research and education should explore ways of encouraging educational institutions, research organizations, federal laboratories and industry to share resources. They should provide special consideration for funding projects that are developed by consortia of institutions.

15. Federal funding for science and technology should be allocated in open competition, based on peer review.

16. To enhance technology transfer and industry-university research partnerships, universities, industries and federal agencies should develop flexible and negotiable policies governing intellectual property rights.

Engineering education today is adapting to the changing context of engineering practice, but more can be done to speed and improve the process. A crucial means of accomplishing needed change is through partnerships with industry, government and the broader educational communities. The policy statements and action items developed in this project are intended to help ensure that engineering education will be RELEVANT, ATTRACTIVE and CONNECTED well into the next century.

Endnotes

1. Morrow, Richard M., January, 1994. Presented as a Plenary Address to the 1993 ASEE Centennial Conference, *Journal of Engineering Education*, Washington, D.C.

2. ASEE, 1986. "Quality of Engineering Education: Final Report of the Quality of Engineering Education Project." American Society for Engineering Education, Washington, D.C.

ASEE, May, 1988, "Report of the Engineering Deans Council Task Force on the Engineering Student Pipeline," *Engineering Education*, American Society for Engineering Education, Washington, D.C.

ASEE, July/August 1989, "Engineering Faculty For the 1990s and Beyond," Report of the Engineering Deans Council Task Force on the Faculty Pipeline," *Engineering Education*, American Society for Engineering Education, Washington, D.C.

NRC, November, 1993, "Major Issues In Engineering Education, a Working Paper of the Board On Engineering Education," National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

Related Organizations and Studies

Engineering Education Coalitions Used for Reference in Study

ECSEL (Engineering Coalition of Schools for Excellence in Education and Leadership)—The participating universities are the City College of New York, Howard University, University of Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Morgan State University, Pennsylvania State University and University of Washington

Synthesis Coalition—The participating universities are California State University at San Luis Obispo,University of California at Berkeley, Cornell University, Hampton University, Iowa State University, Southern University, Stanford University and Tuskegee University.

SUCCEED (Southeastern University and College Coalition for Engineering Education)—The participating universities are Clemson, Florida A&M University/Florida State University, University of Florida, Georgia Institute of Technology, North Carolina A&T State University, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, North Carolina State University and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

GATEWAY Coalition—The participating universities are Case Western Reserve University, Columbia University, Drexel University, Cooper Union, Florida International University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Ohio State University, University of Pennsylvania, Polytechnic University and University of South Carolina.

Related Studies in Progress

National Research Council, Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy, "Graduate Education in Engineering and Science"

National Research Council, Board on Engineering Education, "Major Issues in Engineering Education"

National Academy of Engineering, "Academic Engineering Research in a Changing World: Issues, Problems and Solutions"

National Science Foundation, "Restructuring Engineering Education: A Systems Approach to Integrated Curricula"

Task Groups

Reinventing the Teaching and Learning Environment

Chair: James Eifert
Dean of Engineering
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

Chuck Allport
Director of Engineering Programs
Cedarville College

Burton Colvin
Deputy Director for Academic Affairs
National Institute of Standards and Technology

Billy L. Crynes
Dean of Engineering
University of Oklahoma

Thomas Davis
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Milwaukee School of Engineering

Eugene Deloatch
Dean of Engineering
Morgan State University

Stephen Director
Dean of Engineering
Carnegie Mellon University

Norman Fortenberry
Education Directorate
National Science Foundation

John Gage
Director of Science Office
Sun Microsystems, Inc.

Stephen Gage
President
Cleveland Advanced Manufacturing Program

Wesley Harris
Associate Administrator
NASA

David Kao
former Dean of Engineering
Iowa State University

Paul King
Dean of Engineering
Northeastern University

R. Charlene King
Director
National Security Education Program

W. H. Kothin
Manager of Staffing
DuPont Corporation

Frank Lutz
Dean of Engineering
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Michael A. Paolino
Dean of Engineering
Lafayette College

George Peterson
Executive Director
Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology

Stephen Ritter
Dean of Engineering
University of Texas-El Paso

Richard Seaberg
former Dean of Engineering
University of Colorado-Boulder

Clifford Smith
President
General Electric Foundation

Richard Stephens
former Director, University and Science Education, US Department of Energy

Donald Weisstuch
Senior Vice President and General Manager
Sverdrup

William J. Wilhelm
Dean of Engineering
Wichita State University

David Wormley
Dean of Engineering
Pennsylvania State University

Value-Added of an Undergraduate Engineering Education

Chair: William Schowalter
Dean of Engineering
University of Illinois-Urbana

Robert Barfield
Dean of Engineering
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa

Theodore Bickart
Dean of Engineering
Michigan State University

V. Hary Charyulu
Dean of Engineering
Idaho State University

Mohammed S. Ghausi
Dean of Engineering
University of California-Davis

Joseph I. Goldstein
Dean of Engineering
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Jerrier Haddad
former Vice President, IBM, and President-elect, Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology

Romualdas Kanuba
Dean of Engineering
Northern Illinois University

James Linsteaud
Chairman
Gabriel, Inc.

Robert Ritchie
Director of University Affairs
Hewlett-Packard Corporation

Ernest Sniardon
Dean of Engineering
University of Arizona

Edgar Starke, Jr.
former Dean of Engineering
University of Virginia

Robert L. Sullivan
Dean of Engineering
Florida Institute of Technology

Betty Vetter
Executive Director, Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology

Charles Watkins
Dean of Engineering
City College of the City University of New York

Henry Yang
Chancellor
University of California-Santa Barbara

Lifelong Learning and Re-Directing Career Paths

Chair: J. Ray Bowen
Dean of Engineering
University of Washington

Lionel Baldwin
President
National Technological University

Martin Becker
Provost, Oregon Graduate Institute of Science and Technology

Larry Bonefield
Associate Dean of Academics
Auburn University

Ron Bongelink
Chief Engineer, Aerodynamics Engineering
Boeing Company

S. G. Blouin
Director of New Programs, Continuing Engineering Education
The George Washington University

Christopher Byrnes
Dean of Engineering
Washington University

Peter Cannon
Managing Partner
VRE

David C. Chang
President
Polytechnic University

Cary Fisher
Division Chair, Engineering, United States Air Force Academy, and President, ASEE

Dale Johnson
Attorney of Counsel
DJ Associates, Inc.

Thomas Keane
DuPont Fellow
DuPont Company

Constantine Papadakis
Dean of Engineering
University of Cincinnati

Neil Schmitt
Dean of Engineering
University of Arkansas

Jonathan Scudder
Corporate Chief Scientist
Litton Industries

Donald Stager
Vice President and General Manager
Spacecraft Technology Division, TRW

Jerry E. Stonaking
Dean of Engineering
University of Tennessee

Herbert Woodson
Dean of Engineering
University of Texas-Austin

Changing Focus of Research and Graduate Education

Chair: John Bollinger
Dean of Engineering
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Harry Armen
Director of Research
Northrup Grumman Aerospace & Electronics

David Auston
Provost
Rice University

Alan Daniels
Consultant to the President
Phillips Laboratories

Roger Eichhorn
Dean of Engineering
University of Houston

Don Giddens
Dean of Engineering
The Johns Hopkins University

T. H. Glisson
Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University

Thomas R. Hanley
Dean of Engineering
University of Louisville

Terrance Heng
Director of External Technology Planning, Motorola

Christopher Hill
Senior Analyst
Rand/Critical Technologies Institute

John Hocker
Director, Technical Operations
Martin Marietta Corporation

David Hodges
Dean of Engineering
University of California-Berkeley

Marshall Lih
Engineering Directorate
National Science Foundation

Anthony Michel
Dean of Engineering
University of Notre Dame

Joel Moses
Dean of Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Donald Polk
Director, Special Programs
Office of Naval Research

Harvey G. Stenger
Interim Dean
Lehigh University

The New Vision of Universities

Chair: George Dieter
former Dean of Engineering
University of Maryland-College Park

Erich Bloch
Distinguished Fellow
Council on Competitiveness

James Brandeberry
Dean of Engineering and Computer Science
Wright State University

William Butcher
Engineering Directorate
National Science Foundation

Michael Carroll
Dean of Engineering
Rice University

Edward W. Ernst
Professor of Engineering
University of South Carolina

H. C. M. Erzurumlu
Dean of Engineering
Portland State University

Lyle Feisel
Dean of Engineering
State University of New York-Binghamton

Richard Kenyon
Dean of Engineering
Union College

Frank Owens
Director, Educational Affairs Division
NASA

Edward Parrish
Dean of Engineering
Vanderbilt University

Michael Polis
Dean of Engineering and Computer Science
Oakland University

Norman Smith
Dean of Engineering
University of Maine

John Spencer
Manager
Port Authority of NY and NJ

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Society for
Engineering Education
1818 N Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036-2479
(202) 331-3500

Frank L. Huband
Executive Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE